DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 539 UD 026 616

AUTHOR Bossone, Richard M., Ed.; Polishook, Irwin H., Ed.
TITLE School/College/Business Partnerships. Proceedings: The Conference of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force (10th, Santa Barbara, California, November 4-5, 1988).
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Graduate School and Univ. Center.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 93p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business Responsibility; College Faculty; College Role; *Cooperative Programs; Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Higher Education; Philanthropic Foundations; Public Schools; Racial Integration; *School Business Relationship; *School Community Relationship; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Collaboratives; Partnerships

ABSTRACT

The participants in this conference were in virtual agreement that improvement in urban public education is largely dependent on economic and racial equity and that schools, colleges, and businesses must unite through collaborative projects to ensure this improvement. Papers presented were the following: (1) Businessman: "Private Sector Support for Public Education" (W. S. Woodside), with reactions from W. J. Hume, W. C. Selover, and W. C. Steere, Jr.; (2) School Chancellor: "Partnerships: Reinvestment in Urban Communities" (R. R. Green), with reactions from R. W. Clark, P. D. Houston, and M. W. Prophet; (3) College President: "School/College Faculty Alliances: The Critical Connection" (C. L. Gaudiani), with reactions from L. M. Goldstein, D. W. Hopkins, and H. M. Proshansky; (4) Foundation Director: "Appropriate Involvement: Private Grantmaking and School Reform" (E. R. Wilson), with reactions from A. S. Alexander, P. C. Hutchinson, and P. M. Ostergard; (5) Examples of Partnerships: "Successful Educational Partnerships in America" (T. L. Gross), with reactions from S. R. Aiello, W. Carlson, and F. P. Wilbur; and (6) Evaluations of Partnerships: "School/Business Partnerships: Summary of Findings from Two Research Projects" (T. Smith), with reactions from M. Levine, R. J. Shavelson, and M. D. Usdan. A summation by D. Mann concluded the proceedings. A list of conference participants is included. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303539

2-2-89

PROCEEDINGS:

The Tenth Conference of the
University / Urban Schools National Task Force

School/College/Business Partnerships

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard M Bossone
Grad. School of CUNY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Edited by Richard M. Bossone
and Irwin H. Polishook

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

LB 2326 .6

PROCEEDINGS:

The Tenth Conference of the
University / Urban Schools National Task Force

School/College/Business Partnerships

November 4 and 5, 1988
Santa Barbara

Edited by Richard M. Bossone
and Irwin H. Polishook

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

1989

PREFACE

American reform movements tend to exaggerate social problems in order to enhance the luster of proposed solutions. Recent experience with educational reform follows this pattern of the past. The shock value of A Nation at Risk, published a little more than five years ago, noted a "tidal wave" of mediocrity that threatened to engulf and destroy excellence in our nation's classrooms. The residual message of this apocalyptic document was a warning about the long-term danger of continuing failure in public education. This call to reform, like a moral and prophetic clarion, left little room for a balanced evaluation of the American public school condition and an understanding of the limitations of the public school as a social institution.

Not all public school districts are riven with failure. Throughout the country our best high schools rival much publicized competitors found in foreign lands, most notably Japan and West Germany. Our culture is so concerned with success, however, that we literally abhor the symptoms of inadequacy that reflect imperfections of our society. We must understand that it is the vitality of the public school tradition that makes possible an enhanced expectation of intellectual and personal progress.

What is clear in these Proceedings is the hopeful strain which represents the American culture. We are a people committed to reform; the nation's character demands perfection and permits no false pride to hide any revealed condition of educational need. The current unfolding of educational reform reflects these tendencies--a sweeping condemnation of failure as well as the eager anticipation of change and improvement. Surely

one of the most hopeful items on the reform agenda is the example of school/college/business partnerships.

These endeavors are hardly novel. Higher education has long been the beneficiary of a connection with the corporate world, a relationship that remains intact with ties growing out of an ongoing technological revolution. The corporate community has always had some interest in the lower schools, if only in the hope of obtaining a better educated workforce. What is different today is the recognition by business leaders that their personal advocacy and educational intervention are required to produce better high school graduates.

The expansion of partnerships has been explosive. Individual projects have more than tripled in the last five years, increasing from 40,000 in 1983 to over 140,000 in 1988. These programs vary considerably, from adopt-a-school projects to special academic collaborations, combining the resources of business, schools, as well as colleges and universities.

The many examples of partnerships are very well represented in these Proceedings. Similarly represented are those cautions necessary to keep the partnership phenomenon from being oversold as an instrument of reform. In addition, a recurring idea is the limited impact which partnerships can have in the overall progress of educational change, as well as the recognition that business participation should generate models of reform in different parts of the nation. The conference participants were in virtual agreement that improvement in urban public education is largely dependent on economic and racial equity and that schools, colleges, and businesses must unite through collaborative projects to ensure this improvement.

R.M.B.
I.H.P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
PREFACE			ii
PARTICIPANTS			v
PERSPECTIVES ON SCHOOL/COLLEGE/BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS			
BUSINESSMAN:	Private Sector Support for Public Education	William S. Woodside	1
	Reactors:	William J. Hume	10
		William C. Selover	11
		William C. Steere, Jr.	12
SCHOOL CHANCELLOR:	Partnerships: Reinvestment in Urban Communities	Richard R. Green	15
	Reactors:	Richard W. Clark	23
		Paul D. Houston	24
		Matthew W. Prophet	25
COLLEGE PRESIDENT:	School/College Faculty Alliances: The Critical Connection	Claire L. Gaudiani	26
	Reactors:	Leon M. Goldstein	32
		David W. Hopkins	33
		Harold M. Proshansky	33
FOUNDATION DIRECTOR:	Appropriate Involvement: Private Grantmaking and School Reform	Eugene R. Wilson	36
	Reactors:	Anne S. Alexander	45
		Peter C. Hutchinson	46
		Paul M. Ostergard	47
EXAMPLES OF PARTNERSHIPS:	Successful Educational Partnerships in America	Theodore L. Gross	50
	Reactors:	Stephen R. Aiello	59
		Wayne Carlson	60
		Franklin P. Wilbur	61
EVALUATIONS OF PARTNERSHIPS:	School/Business Partnerships: Summary of Findings from Two Research Projects	Tom Smith	63
	Reactors:	Marsha Levine	69
		Richard J. Shavelson	70
		Michael D. Usdan	71
SUMMATION:		Dale Mann	73

TENTH CONFERENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY/URBAN SCHOOLS NATIONAL TASK FORCE

CONFERENCE PARTICPANTS

Chairman

Dr. Richard M. Bossone
University Dean for Instructional Research
Graduate School and University Center
City University of New York

Moderator

Mr. Fred H. Hechinger
President
New York Times Foundation, Inc.

Participants

Dr. Stephen R. Aiello
Executive Vice President and Director of Public Affairs
Burson-Marsteller, New York

Ms. Anne S. Alexander
Vice President, Education Programs
AT&T Foundation, New York

Dr. Rita C. Altman
Associate Superintendent
School District of Philadelphia

Dr. Betty Bamberg
Director, Freshman Writing Program
University of Southern California

Mr. Ronald Boehm
President
ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara

Mr. Wayne Carlson
Director of Partnership Programs
Los Angeles Unified School District

Mr. William J. Cirone
County Superintendent
Santa Barbara County Schools, California

Dr. Richard W. Clark
Deputy Superintendent
Bellevue Public Schools, Washington

Mr. James W. Constance
Investor
Santa Barbara, California

Dr. Robert T. DeVries
Director, University and College Relationships
Los Angeles Unified School District

The Honorable Edith B. Everett
Vice Chairperson, Board of Trustees
City University of New York

Mr. Henry J. Everett
President
Lexington Associates, New York City

Mr. Otto M. Fridia
Deputy Superintendent
Dallas Independent School District

Mr. Raul Garza
Public Relations Manager
AT&T, Los Angeles

Dr. Claire L. Gaudiani
President
Connecticut College, New London

Mrs. Stella Gilrod
President
Gilrod Foundation, New York City

Mr. Leon M. Goldstein
President, Kingsborough Community College
City University of New York

Dr. Cynthia Goodman
Educational Consultant
Los Gatos, California

Dr. Thomas L. Goodman
Superintendent
Santa Clara County Office of Education

Dr. Richard R. Green
Chancellor
New York City Public Schools

Dr. Theodore L. Gross
President
Roosevelt University, Chicago

Mrs. Theodore L. Gross
Teacher
Chicago

Dr. Warren C. Hayman
Program Coordinator
Johns Hopkins University

Dr. Willie W. Herenton
Superintendent
Memphis Public Schools, Tennessee

Dr. David W. Hopkins
Superintendent/President
Monterey Peninsula College, California

Dr. Paul D. Houston
Superintendent
Tucson Unified School District, Arizona

Mr. William J. Hume
Chairman of the Board
Basic American Foods, Inc., San Francisco

Mr. Peter C. Hutchinson
Vice President, External Affairs
Dayton Hudson Corporation and
Chairman, Dayton Hudson Foundation, Minneapolis

Ms. Phyllis Kaminer
President
Instructional Systems, Inc., New Jersey

Dr. Marsha Levine
Associate Director, Educational Issues
American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Gerald W. Lynch
President, John Jay College
City University of New York

Dr. Dale Mann
Center for Education and the American Economy
Teachers College, Columbia University

The Honorable Louise P. Matteoni
Regent
University of the State of New York

Dr. Michael McLaughlan
Superintendent
Santa Barbara City Schools

Mr. Charles A. Napoli
Principal
Keene High School, New Hampshire

Ms. Janie Noble
Director, Research and Development
University/Urban Schools National Task Force, Santa Barbara

Mr. Paul M. Ostergard
President
General Electric Foundation, Connecticut

Dr. Irwin H. Polishook
President, Professional Staff Congress
City University of New York

Dr. Matthew W. Prophet
Superintendent
Portland Public Schools, Oregon

Mrs. Etta Proshansky
Director, Staff Development Center, District 4
New York City Public Schools

Dr. Harold M. Proshansky
President, Graduate School
City University of New York

Dr. Diana W. Rigden
Director of Precollege Programs
Council for Aid to Education, New York City

Dr. John Romo
Vice President
Santa Barbara City College

Ms. Mary DePiano Rothlein
Dean, John Jay College
City University of New York

Mr. William C. Selover
Public Affairs Manager
Los Angeles Regional Office
Ford Motor Company

Dr. Richard J. Shavelson
Dean, Graduate School of Education
University of California at Santa Barbara

Mr. Tom Smith
Vice President and Director of External Affairs
Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia

Mr. William C. Steere, Jr.
President
Pfizer Pharmaceuticals, New York

Dr. Michael D. Usdan
President
Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Max Weiner
Dean, Graduate School of Education
Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York City

Dr. Franklin P. Wilbur
Director, Project Advance
Syracuse University, New York

Mr. Eugene R. Wilson
President
ARCO Foundation, Los Angeles

Mr. William S. Woodside
Chairman, Sky Chefs Inc. and
former Chairman, Primerica Corporation, New York City

PRIVATE SECTOR SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

William S. Woodside
Former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Primerica Corporation and
Chairman, SkyChefs, Inc.

Let us begin by looking back five years. Nineteen eighty-three was not a particularly promising year for public education. A Nation At Risk had just been published and had been--somewhat unexpectedly--the subject of extraordinary public attention. No one could be certain if the report represented a major recommitment to public education or if the report was an event on the order of a last hurrah.

There was good reason for concern. We had just come through a major recession. Reaganomics had taken hold of the federal budget process. Dramatic cuts were occurring in both taxes and spending, with the promise of more to come. Government agencies and nonprofit organizations that were involved in such areas as education, health, housing, and nutrition were trying to figure out how to stretch increasingly limited dollars to meet rapidly growing needs.

As a nation, we seemed poised to turn our back on 50 years of history. Programs that made a difference in peoples' lives clearly were out of favor--especially if they cost tax dollars. And the national debate, to the extent one existed, centered not on how best to help people and institutions in need, but why we should be involved at all.

The situation has changed somewhat now. Indeed, some trends may be reversing themselves. Our economy has shown steady and solid improvement.

Unemployment rates have declined, although poverty rates remain discouragingly high. Federal funding is not what it should be, but the worst of the budget cuts are over. There are signs the public once again is accepting the idea that government can be a positive force in peoples' lives. And A Nation At Risk, instead of being the burial of public education, has turned out to be a new beginning of sorts, a triggering point for vital national efforts to improve the quality of pre-collegiate education.

Within a surprisingly short period of time, virtually every aspect of public education has been the subject of a serious inquiry. The objective has not been to trash our public schools or to simply gather data; it has been to find ways to improve public school systems. The whole system has been examined: the curriculum, the problems teachers face, the classroom environment, the needs of minority and disadvantaged children, the role of community groups, administrative and management issues, even the physical condition of school buildings themselves.

Despite some positive outward signs, however, it is not clear that public education has yet achieved the political and social support necessary to sustain it in the years ahead. If the education community fails to capitalize fully on the current window of opportunity, it may find itself in a much more difficult position four or five years from now.

An important example is the role that the private sector has been playing in public education. The involvement of the private sector in public education during the late 1970s and the early 1980s was an important development. Business had been involved with higher education for years. But except for placing an occasional corporate executive on a school board

or in short term school management assignments, it had steered clear of elementary and secondary school education. Business leaders knew public schools were important. We just thought someone else should worry about them. The connection between the corporation and the public school was just too tenuous and too indirect. The controversies which had beset the public schools, such as busing, teacher strikes, competition with private religious schools, were hardly an inducement to business involvement.

Somewhere along the line, though, in the midst of all the growing concern about international competitiveness, the national economy, adult illiteracy, and our future work force, the business community began to realize it did in fact have an important stake in the future of our public schools. The fact that many CEOs, myself included, were products of the public schools, did not hurt.

Indeed, the key ingredient of most early successful school business partnerships was the personal participation of executives and employees on a regular basis, not all of them, but enough to convey the message that this was not a haphazard or trivial effort, and enough so that the business community learned from their experience as well.

New types of corporate involvement and support of public education have emerged as a result: community-wide coalitions that seek specific program and management objectives; advocacy groups that lobby in Washington, state capitols, and city hall on behalf of established education programs that work and for new ideas that deserve to be tested. The more the business community became involved, the more it learned about the strengths and weaknesses of each type of activity. In addition, the business community arrived at some conclusions about the roles it could and

could not play in public education.

The concept of public-private partnerships may have come into vogue when major cutbacks started to occur in government programs. But the business community understood very quickly that it was not in a position to assume the responsibilities of government. The business community does not have the financial, administrative, or political capacities to develop and operate public school systems. Even if it did, it would not be a good idea. Who wants the education of our children to flourish or wane dependent upon whether corporate profits are rising or falling, or whether a certain product or service becomes a major success?

With respect to the future of school business partnerships, it is important not to take the successes of the recent past too much for granted. In any organized activity, particularly one which is new and innovative and creates a lot of excitement and publicity for the participants, there comes a point when the parties start to lose interest. Yesterday's innovation becomes today's routine. You get tired and bored. Nobody is paying much attention anymore. You do not hear the praise you once did. The support system that fueled the early interest of the participants starts to fall away. Your motivation begins to evaporate, and intertia begins to set in.

There are some early warning signs that this is beginning to happen to the American corporation with respect to public education. The more I talk with business colleagues about various public policy issues and corporate social responsibility programs, the more it seems that the American corporation is turning inward. It is as if the corporations were saying: We did our job for five years. Now leave us alone so we can get back to

giving our business all our attention.

A second source of concern is the changing structure of American business. In a very basic sense, it is no longer operating as it used to. When corporations became involved in public education, they did so largely because they sensed they had some important ties to local communities, ties worth building, ties worth maintaining. After all, these were the communities where they were located, and the public schools were an important ingredient in the quality of community well-being. But the growth of conglomerates, mergers, acquisitions and absentee ownership are making it difficult to sustain many ties between corporate America and local communities. Convincing industry that its own self-interest lies in well-educated kids who live in its own back yard is a much tougher sell when the corporate headquarters is a thousand miles away and the vision of the future is increasingly seen in 90-day cycles.

These two problems--the five-year slump and the impact of changing corporate profiles on community ties--are important to consider not because public education is about to lose the private sector support it has worked so hard to maintain or because the private sector wants out, but because we need to understand, as clearly and specifically as possible, the business environment in which we are working and the changes that are occurring within that environment. Otherwise, we will be acting on a set of assumptions that may not even exist or which, if they do, may be irrelevant.

The support generated during the last several years will not disappear or dissipate easily. But that is not the problem public education advocates face. Our problem is that we need to further strengthen and expand the ties between business and the public schools. And in order to

do this, the education community cannot take too much for granted. Yesterday's corporate concern is not an automatic guarantee of the public school's place on tomorrow's corporate agenda.

The days when the private sector would come to the schools are pretty much over. Now the schools and their supporters may have to seek out the private sector. More specifically, educators will have to:

Document and demonstrate that business has a direct stake in public education;

Describe the ways in which our economic future will be determined by what happens in our public schools;

Convince business that this is one issue in which it cannot afford to be uninvolved; and

Demonstrate success.

We have done reasonably well on the first three priorities, all of which are closely interrelated. It is this fourth factor, however, the success factor, which may be the most important issue for the future.

If educators want business to stay involved, indeed, if we want to keep public support for the educational reform movement, then we will have to demonstrate that we have a product worth investing in. Many businessmen, in fact, many citizens, still cling to a view of public schools as a tired old institution that has not changed for twenty-five years and will not change for at least another twenty-five.

This is the wrong time for school bureaucracies to hunker down, to resist change. Change is opportunity, and the opportunity to change will not last forever. The failure to implement changes in the way our schools are managed could stall the education reform movement and ultimately doom it. And cycles of interest are such that it will be very difficult to renew interest in public education for a long time afterwards.

I am not predicting doom and gloom; I am only expressing a healthy reminder of the stakes that are involved. In fact, for the most part, I remain pleasantly upbeat about the persistence, breadth, and growing sophistication of the education reform movement.

The latest manifestation of my optimism is the report issued late last year by the Committee for Economic Development (CED) on the educational needs of disadvantaged children.

"This nation," the CED report says, "cannot continue to compete and prosper in the global arena when more than one-fifth of our children live in poverty and a third grow up in ignornance. The nation can ill afford such an egregious waste of human resouces. Allowing this to continue will not only impoverish these children, it will impoverish our nation--culturally, politically, economically."

This is a remarkable report, both because of the message and because of the messenger. It recognizes the importance of viewing education not as an isolated phenomenon, but as a process that integrates and builds upon all we have learned about human growth and development. In calling once again for the business community to become a "driving force" for the changes it recommends, the CED reaffirms its earlier position that the economic future of our communities and our nation demands that business become involved in public education.

Marching orders about the overriding importance of public education have thus penetrated to the highest levels of corporate America. Our job is to assure that this critical message is disseminated as widely as possible and that its recommendations do not sit on the shelf.

WOODSIDE:

An Afterword

One subject that should not be excluded from this discussion of educational partnerships is the relationship of American universities and the business world. Despite the obvious preponderance of financial support that higher education receives from business compared to the lower schools, few of my associates believe expanding their college programing is a priority. All attention is now focused on the improvement of public schools and concern for the future workforce. It is also ironic to note that many university educators give little regard to what is happening in the schools, especially public education, as if the nation's educational alarm need not be their urgent concern.

I sometimes think some university leaders act as if the typical college freshman comes completely developed from Zeus' head, without requiring their regard or nurture. We should all be dismayed that many American colleges and universities do not share the business community's commitment to the improvement of public urban education. This indifference is shortsighted. It may have the effect of turning business away from long standing collaborations with higher education that also serve the public interest.

R E A C T O R S

William J. Hume
Chairman of the Board
Basic American Foods, Inc.

William C. Selover
Public Affairs Manager
Ford Motor Company

William C. Steere, Jr.
President
Pfizer Pharmaceuticals

HUME:

Change is the urgent requirement of American public education. For change to occur, we have to institutionalize its prescriptions and rebuild education's very foundations. William Woodside focuses intelligently on the extraordinary re-examination that public education has undergone since the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983; he praises the energy with which American business leaders have promoted educational reform. What is clear is that the "cycles of interest" toward education which Woodside identifies among American corporations may not outlast the continuing debacle of dropouts and failures that characterize too many urban school districts.

Educational reform cannot be sustained unless the education establishment is committed to this cause as a matter of manifest self-interest. Consider the present structure of American schooling. Right now education in the United States is a free, mandated service for children ages 6 through 16; they can go elsewhere to meet the state's educational requirements, but only at their own expense. The public schools are also characterized by mandatory districting, with strict limitations within which school enrollment is available for a particular family. One can change to a new school district only by moving to another residence. This structure may be designed for efficiency and to secure local control over public education, but the system seems impervious to needed reform.

The California Business Roundtable has been in the forefront of the Golden State's commitment to educational reform. What we seek is to institutionalize change by restructuring the rewards. Why should we continue

to ignore academic performance when we establish budgets for our public schools? Is it possible to establish state-wide goals to measure effective educational outcomes? Can we develop new forms of testing that encourage the highest educational standards in California? Why not put pressure on failing schools and teachers by informing parents about school success, permitting families greater choice in school selection, and giving higher salaries to those teachers who are most effective? These and a succession of related questions represent the vanguard of change needed to sustain the corporate interest in our nation's public schools.

By themselves, school and business partnerships can do no more than achieve temporary results for the cause of educational reform. These collaborations are important as demonstrations of what is needed to nurture successful education. True reform will only be achieved if we connect the educational system rewards with student success and penalize the educational system if students fail.

SELOVER:

After the Second World War, the Ford Motor Company underwent a massive reorganization of finances and products that ultimately saved this great corporation from bankruptcy. Today Ford is a strong and vibrant operation, with a balance sheet last year that showed greater profitability than its largest automotive rivals. Our concerns are now concentrated on people, especially how to recruit and retain a superior work force. We know the quality of Ford's "people" is crucial to the company's future success.

As William Woodside makes very clear, the present era may be a last

window of opportunity for America's public schools. It is not just a question of our employees being able to know more in all areas of recruitment. Too many of the people we bring to the business of making automobiles are not well educated. We spend many millions of dollars on the basic skills training of our work force. What concerns me is that this real, repeated "tax" on corporations to educate their employees will eventually destroy the business commitment to public education.

This is why Ford supports business-school partnerships. Our interest extends beyond self-interest to a regard for the principles and values held by ordinary American citizens who come to work for our company. We realize that regard for every aspect of what makes a human personality is needed to turn around the blight of failure attacking urban school districts everywhere in the country. The better worker will also be a better citizen. Educational reform must be expanded into a wider concern for the less fortunate and a regard for the improvement, not perfection, of those who want productive employment in American corporations. The burden of Ford and other corporate enterprises is to accept this obligation of national service.

STEERE:

International competitiveness is now a national priority. What our corporate leaders realize is that the global economy in which we contend leaves only the smallest margins between success and failure. At one time in our past, investments of capital and entrepreneurs more than made up for shortfall in the capacity of the workforce. Maybe educational competence once

counted less in the industrial sector than an employee's work ethic and willingness to do what he was told. Today's business world is quite different. An educated workforce is a "bottom line" requirement for industrial growth. American industry has discovered that its newly recruited workers are unable to meet educational standards established within the country's typical workplace.

Some dimensions of this problem (reported in Fortune, November 7, 1988) merely point up the catastrophic nature of our difficulties in getting competent people to match the employment needs of the average American company:

- About 700,000 students (among 3.8 million 18-year old Americans) drop out of school before graduation; and another 700,000 could not read their diplomas.
- Functional illiteracy among minority students exceeds 35 percent. By the year 2000, the majority of all school children in at least ten states will be composed of minorities.
- Welfare families cost the government an average of $4,300 each year; most of these poverty stricken adults are school dropouts.
- This year the New York Telephone Company reported that 84 percent of 23,000 people tested for entry-level jobs failed.
- In New York City's public schools, thousands of youngsters have their education interrupted by drug addiction and unwanted pregnancies. At Chicago's DuSable High School, 300 pregnancies were recorded in one year among its population of 1,000 girls.

These figures are the description of an educational disaster. We know our urban public schools may be failing more than a third of all students

and graduating a veritable generation of functional illiterates. Business has assumed an obligation to provide remedial education for new hires, with costs for American companies exceeding $40 billion. This staggering social reality is at the foundation of the educational collaborations of businesses and schools.

By itself, the business community will not turn around the spiral of educational failures. Our partnerships with the schools are efforts to help the schools help themselves. The chief executives of our nation's leading corporations are anxious to serve their own self-interest by gaining a thorough understanding of school problems. Improving the industrial workforce calls for a common effort in which both business and school leaders use various forms of collaboration as the spearhead of educational progress.

PARTNERSHIPS: REINVESTMENT IN URBAN COMMUNITIES

Richard R. Green
Chancellor
New York City Public Schools

Partnerships between business and education are collaborative enterprises linking participants who together establish strategies and joint ventures to improve educational opportunities. A partnership reaches out to the schools in recognition of mutual interests that are served through better educated youth and ultimately citizens able and willing to contribute to the success of our nation's changing economy.

It is evident that business must, in its own self interest, join with the education system to enhance and enrich the quality of the educational process. The corporate sector must have a competitive, productive workforce. This can be achieved if students receive the necessary skills to enter a work world fast approaching the twenty-first century.

To be employable, students must have problem-solving skills, command of the English language, self-discipline, and the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge and abilities. Partnership programs can also foster important work attitudes, such as understanding the need for competent performance, setting priorities, collaborating with others, communicating adequately, and willingness to understand new concepts. In short, the character and competence of their employees are among the principal concerns of our nation's business leaders.

This is why business and education have joined hands to secure a better future for our children. Business leaders have served on local

school boards; industries have been involved in vocational education; business executives have participatd in cooperative education programs and student internships programs; local, smaller businesses have sponsored athletic and extracurricular activities.

But a sophisticated partnership can do much more. For example, business executives might examine the potential for improving education by working directly with community organizations or they might actually establish new organizations that may be needed to improve education. Moreover, since the business community understands what is required for successful employment, it can provide curriculum input and career development information. The potential for business and education to cooperate should not be limited by conservative restraints on our mutual creativity.

Business leaders can also lobby for local education funds. They have a responsibility to inform their employees about educational issues and encourage them to participate in their local school boards. Corporate executives are also needed to work directly in the schools as tutors and resource experts, thereby cooperating with teachers and students to enhance certain skills. In addition, they can provide summer internships for teachers that offer valuable opportunities; and for students, business executives can provide valuable insights into the business world while teaching the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. They also give valuable mentoring experiences to students who gain self-esteem by working with role models.

Just as important is the way business can validate education's response to the unique challenges of our time by acknowledging and supporting

successful programs. Interaction with the schools will serve to direct the commitment of public/private resources and add very special persuasive voices and allies for those children who lack advocates.

Business can assist and guide schools in the application of modern management techniques. Corporate planning techniques might also help schools better forecast the rapidly changing demographics pertaining to the student/teacher population. Business can also assist the schools in recognizing, selecting, and training talented principals and administrators.

Public/private partnerships involve complex relations between large organizations. A successful partnership requires a clear understanding by all parties of what each participant will bring to the relationship. Each side's expectations must be clarified and understood; disparate factors such as differences among local school districts, the diversity of corporate culture, and the size of various business enterprises must be reconciled within the partnership structure. A successful collaboration between business and education should bring all the elements of the community together: students, teachers, school administrators, parents, and business executives. Each partner should recognize the essential and mutual goal of improving student performance, encouraging a heightened sense of student self-esteem, nurturing and enhancing student ability, and creating a lasting bond between student and adult.

Different partnerships may have different objectives. In New York City, the Murry Bergtraum High School for Business Careers is a collaboration between the New York City Board of Education and the City's banking and financial communities. Students receive an academic diploma,

complete coursework in banking and finance, and have the opportunity to participate in internship programs. In this instance, the business community joined with the school system to design the curriculum.

Another New York City project is the Academy of Finance, which is under the particular sponsorship of American Express. This program, operating citywide, trains high school students for the world of business and finance and its curriculum was designed by a team of educators, businessmen, and student interns. This ongoing partnership has now been replicated in fourteen cities across the nation.

Such diverse participants as the Chemical Bank, the New York Daily News, and the Board of Education sponsor the Lincoln-Douglas Debate Program. This endeavor was developed when the Chemical Bank realized that many New York City high school graduates did not have adequate verbal skills. The partners sponsor debates throughout the academic year which serve to improve and develop student verbal skills and stimulate student awareness of the importance of communication in personal and career growth.

In Minneapolis, the Future Employability/Early Childhood Development Task Force focuses on problems of long-term unemployment. This Task Force, created by the Minneapolis Business Community Employment Alliance, discovered certain problems in early years of social and intellectual development. As a result, Task Force members urged business, government, and civic leaders to work with disadvantaged children virtually from birth to ensure their employability as adults.

The Atlanta Partnership of Business and Education sponsors several programs that target at-risk youth: Adopt-a-School, which pairs schools and businesses; Affirmative Action/Adopt-a-Student, which pairs business

volunteers with individual high school students; and Distinguished Scholars-Humanities, which links university faculty and teachers. The Atlanta Partnership also provides internships for students, helps plan school curriculum, and offers managerial assistance to schools.

New Hampshire's Corporate Council for Critical Skills (CCCS) seeks to improve the problem-solving abilities and critical-thinking skills of high school students and organizes training institutes for teachers in skills that can be applied throughout school curricula. A similar project in Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Alliance for Teaching Humanities in the Schools (PATHS), is aimed at improving the teaching of writing in all subjects.

B. Dalton, Inc., the largest American retail bookseller, is recruiting volunteers nationwide to tutor illiterate adults through community organizations. The company provides the funding, management assistance, and employee support for the program.

Time Inc. also operates a nationwide program designed to reach both school children who need remedial assistance and adult illiterates as well. "Time to Read" uses employee volunteers and Time publications in person-to-person tutoring at company locations. "Time to Read" joins with community organizations in recruiting students and providing support services.

Adopting a school is a highly visible and well known form of a business partnership that can cover an array of activities. The sponsor may be a large corporation, a small business, a community organization, a non-profit institution, or a church. Forms of support may include guest speakers, demonstrations, donation of equipment, special awards, or tutoring.

The district-wide "Adopt-a-School" program in Memphis, Tennessee, was

aimed at gaining public support for public schools, and it has stimulated greater business and community support for the system. In Purchase, New York, the MONY Financial Services Company and the Port Chester school system operate an "Adopt-a-Kid" program that is aimed at matching severly disadvantaged youth with successful role models. The Boston Compact in Massachusetts exists as an agreement among business, education, and community leaders to improve educational performance and reduce the dropout rate in exchange for guaranteed jobs in the private sector.

The New York City Partnership, a consortium of companies, is an example of a diverse series of relationships with the country's largest school system. Its "Join-a-School" program has attracted the involvement of corporations in over one-half of the city's high schools. For example, Primerica Corporation is a partner with Martin Luther King, Jr. High School; and Ogilvy and Mathers, an advertising agency, and the Coca Cola Bottling Company of New York are partners at James Monroe High School. The partners in these programs promote mentor relationships with students, work experience programs, and internships for career bound graduates.

Another way the New York City Partnership aids the City's education program is through its management analyses of the system. For example, Pinkerton's, Inc. conducted a study of the security system for the Board of Education, and an association of restaurant owners assisted the school system in working on a food service program. In addition, the Partnership has lobbied, on both the national and state level, for educational reform.

We know that in yesterday's world, corporate America could find work for unlimited numbers of unskilled workers. But tomorrow's world, propelled by technological revolution and international competition, demands a different

worker. Working hand-in-hand with business, the American education system can and must provide the pool of employees that will see our nation prosper in the coming century. Working hand-in-hand, they can possibly surmount our most pressing social problems, especially in urban communities.

R E A C T O R S

Richard W. Clark
Deputy Superintendent
Bellevue Public Schools

Paul D. Houston
Superintendent
Tucson Unified School District

Matthew W. Prophet
Superintendent
Portland Public Schools

CLARK:

New York City Chancellor Richard Green has done well to remind us of the importance of trust in relations among participants in school, university, and business partnerships. The lack of such trust is often a barrier to success in these efforts. As I work with the fourteen school and university partnerships which are part of the National Network for Educational Renewal, I have become increasingly aware that our lack of understanding of each other's systems or cultures creates mistrust which interferes with successful partnerships. Green's message that we need to learn about each other is important.

I have seen public school staff members and university faculty reach impasse in efforts to launch renewal projects because the school people did not understand the reward system in higher education and because university faculty assumed that school people wanted to relate to them in the same way as their students on campus. Similar misunderstandings have interfered with well intentioned efforts at cooperation among business representatives and school administrators as business leaders offered solutions to school problems that ignored the diversity of students and the complexity of society's expectations of public schools. School people complaining about business officials' lack of knowledge of schools often add to the lack of trust by displaying ignorance of the social and economic pressures present in a modern business.

When confronted with the problems facing the New York City schools, businesses, schools, and universities will have to respond as real partners to create a new approach to education. Moreover, those concerned with the difficulties of urban schools will need to reach out and work with

the schools in the surrounding communities. In cities which a decade ago were known as upper middle class suburbs, we are seeing difficulties similar to those facing New York, Portland, Tucson, and other urban centers. The trust and understanding required of schools, businesses, and universities must extend to include these emerging urban communities. In all locales, partnerships must seek renewal, not survival.

HOUSTON:

It is difficult to dismiss Chancellor Green's declaration in response to questions that we are at a "breaking point" with regard to this era of transition in American education. What is "at risk" is the institutional integrity of the public schools. Will they survive? Can they survive the social pathology of broken families, corrupting values, and the persistent influences of extraordinary poverty in a land of general prosperity? Every educational reform eventually brings us once more to the limit of widening problems which seem insurmountable.

We are living through an educational era of ambiguity and paradox. The business involvement in school partnerships stems from a recognition of the importance of childhood experiences as well as the need to enhance the quality of the work force. But corporate leaders have to be continually reminded that their distance from social problems should not tempt them to despair of solutions. Chancellor Green's exposition shows that the impressive universe of business-school partnerships are efforts to perfect educational change. The alternative to this enterprise marked by mutual trust is a dismal prospect of social and political disintegration.

PROPHET:

The grave problems affecting our public schools are merely signs of the condition of America's social and economic fabric. It is obvious to me that in education we are reaping the ills of historical disenfranchisements. The adversity of those diverse populations who attend our public schools is getting worse. With the advent of supply-side economics and severe constraints on public spending, the nation's schools are even less able to surmount these impediments to learning that everywhere limit our youth, especially minorities. Ironically, without the means to improve education, support for public schools erodes even further as these institutions work with less to overcome societal problems beyond their control. There is an important role for business in the reform of public education.

Most obvious is corporate advocacy. We need help to remind those who control public monies that our school buildings are aging and that school physical plants in urban America are in urgent need of massive renovation. We also need business-partnership support in order to isolate the problems that children bring to school. Are our youngsters hungry? How much does student drug use and physical violence defeat the best and most devoted teachers? What can we do to reach out beyond the classroom to win a better chance for urban children? What new forms of schooling are needed to advance the cause of reform? Chancellor Green's presentation offers a review of corporate engagement with these issues. We have to guarantee that the lesson of progress through a business commitment is an expanding national movement.

SCHOOL/COLLEGE FACULTY ALLIANCES: THE CRITICAL CONNECTION

Claire L. Gaudiani
President
Connecticut College

Imagine a society that encouraged and expected all its teachers to maintain a life of the mind in the disciplines they teach. Imagine collegial (not hierarchical) relationships between school and college faculty who teach the same discipline in the same local area. Imagine a possible cure for teacher burnout. Imagine a teaching profession in charge of itself the way doctors and lawyers are. What we once were compelled to imagine, now exists as the living principles of "Academic Alliances."

Currently all over the country, 5,000 teachers do not need to hope for a continuing university-level connection with their academic disciplines. They can attend Alliance meetings in foreign languages, biology, physics, English, history, and chemistry. This is a broadening manifestation of school reform. It will not cure all the ills in American education, but at little cost it creates a new model of life-long learning and engagement for school and college faculty. More than 250 Academic Alliances have been established in a network of 41 states.

An Academic Alliance is a group of 12 to 60 school and college faculty who teach the same academic discipline. These faculty meet monthly as a community of inquiry. Members live and work in the same geographical area, usually not more than a 45-minute drive away from the meeting place. As a group of adults who share a common academic discipline, they take responsibility together for the quality of teaching and learning in that

discipline in their local area. Their first concern is the life of the mind of the people who teach that discipline in their locale. Consequently, monthly meetings focus on topics the members want to learn more about and usually teach each other about. They keep each other up-to-date in their field. They do joint journal reading and review. They help each other with the terrors and tricks of teaching the discipline well.

Their different educational levels and the different ages of the students they teach do not stop them from discovering common ground in the discipline. The faculty members work to achieve a collegial environment where all members have something to give and something to get from the interaction.

Effecting curricular change is less often the direct objective of meetings, but participating faculty often find that they learn a great deal about each other's students, syllabi, course objectives, and actual achievements. School teachers begin to have a clearer idea of what college level demands mean in their field which is very important to students about to make the leap from one sector to the other. College faculty gain a sense of their future students, today's high school students, not some mythical group of young people the faculty wish would arrive in September.

Academic Alliances are built on the notion that the seamless web of education is only conceivable if classroom instructors in each sector really know each other, sustain each other, challenge and educate each other in the disciplines they share. It is, finally, people, not institutions who create the profession and its academic disciplines. Teachers are the filaments of the educational web.

Academic Alliance members decide together where, when, and how often

to meet. Some Alliances rotate their meeting places using various institutional sites of members. Others meet regularly at one school or college because it is centrally located or convenient and comfortable for meetings. Still others always meet at a "neutral" site like a local hotel.

Programs vary according to the interests, strengths, and needs of members, but Alliances remain collegial with no one group or person dominating the agenda. Faculty who have gone to pertinent state or national conferences report their experiences. A variety of members do short reviews of relevant recent books in their respective fields so all can keep abreast of developments and directions. Often a school and a college faculty member team up to study and present a piece of work on a given subject. Panel discussions follow presentations so different perspectives on a topic can emerge in interesting ways.

Membership always includes any teaching person who considers himself or herself committed to a particular discipline. Many groups encourage undergraduate majors and graduate students to belong. The new generation entering the profession may never have an opportunity as good as this one with faculty in different academic sectors discussing each other's work, pedagogy, and leading research in a common academic subject.

This model will not solve all the problems of American education. The question is, however, how would American education be improved if the Academic Alliance concept was further encouraged all over the United States. If it were a normal expectation of the professional lives of teachers that they belong to an alliance of faculty who teach their academic discipline in the same local area, would teaching as a profession become a stronger, more attractive option for intelligent people to choose? If teachers had

frequent professional contacts with others who share their academic interests, would teacher burnout be reduced? Would it be easier for faculty to move back and forth across the sectors for diversity and enrichment in their careers? Ultimately, would our curricula be better articulated if school and college teachers knew each other and shared knowledge in the disciplines taught across academic sectors?

As the school reform movement continues, talk of the "professionalization" of teaching has become commonplace. Some leading educators believe teaching should become, professionally, like law or medicine. If this is to occur, however, it cannot be without some features that are basic to the original county bar and county medical society model:

- Teachers at all academic levels must share a collegial professional relationship with one another.
- Teachers must take charge of their own ongoing education in their field or discipline.
- Teachers engaged in work in their field must share what they have learned about their professions regardless of its immediate classroom application or relation to systematic research in the field.

Time is ripe for this model to expand. In June, 1988, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation awarded $600,000 to the American Association of Higher Education to expand the Academic Alliance project which I began in 1981 with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, The Rockefeller Foundation, and the Exxon Education Foundation. This phase of the project, which moves it out of one professor's office to the nation's capitol, is intended to increase the

numbers of alliance groups from 250 to 700. It is also aimed at more deliberate inclusion of elementary school teachers and faculty from historically Black colleges.

Ultimately, American education will not improve unless the teaching corps throughout all the sectors is strengthened and bonded together. Recognizing the critical differences between and among faculty in different sectors and in different disciplines does not excuse the disconnectedness of faculty. We all teach the same students. We all need to maintain a vigorous life of the mind in the discipline we teach. We need to share more effectively many approaches to teaching and thereby better meet students' needs and abilities to learn the various disciplines we teach.

As we prepare to recruit as many as 20 to 50 percent new teaching faculty to fill expected vacancies over the next 15 years, we need to examine new models to assure that professionalization of academic life is real and continuing. Those of us committed to educational reform should be able to imagine the continuing growth of a vigorous, cost-effective model to enable faculty to control their professional engagement with the subjects they teach. Academic Alliances offer an intellectually appropriate way to improve life for America's teachers and teaching in America.

R E A C T O R S

Leon M. Goldstein
President
Kingsborough Community College
City University of New York

David W. Hopkins
Superintendent/President
Monterey Peninsula College

Harold M. Proshansky
President, Graduate School
City University of New York

GOLDSTEIN:

An "Alliance" of college faculty and school teachers in the same discipline, as suggested by President Gaudiani, is an important development in education. This is especially true if this alliance brings together academic professionals with an abiding interest in the improvement of our nation's public schools.

At Kingsborough Community College, we have developed a collaboration called, "College Now" involving college faculty and teachers associated with fifteen New York City high schools. After receiving the cooperation of the college faculty and teacher unions (the Professional Staff Congress/CUNY and the United Federation of Teachers, both affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers), the college brought classroom instructors from both sectors together to develop courses and syllabi and to discuss student performance and out-comes. In addition, high school teachers were employed as college adjunct professors to teach at-risk students with a new curriculum which included remedial classes as well as special courses that might also generate college credit.

At the outset, we believed that the educational program for the students would be the only focus of the program, but the program also turned out to be a wonderful vehicle to prevent teacher "burn out" in high schools known for their difficult academic assignments. The key to our success, as an independent evaluation concluded, was the building of "reciprocal collegial relationships with the administrators and faculty of the participating high school."

The answer to the initial question posed by Gaudiani as to whether or not this model of faculty-teacher alliance is desirable and beneficial is a resounding "yes."

HOPKINS:

The concepts presented by Dr. Claire Gaudiani represent an essential element needed for the improvement of teaching. The individual who bears the largest burden of urban schooling, the teacher, requires every assistance possible. The "Alliance" that Gaudiani has sponsored in all parts of the country gives primacy to the teacher's standing as a professional. There is no better way to reinforce a teacher's commitment and effectiveness than by renewing interest in a particular academic discipline.

No program of this nature can be successful, however, without appropriate released time for teachers and faculty; professional renewal will not be served by impossible burdens, even those accepted voluntarily. Similarly, articulation between teachers and professors requires a selection process that choses those academic leaders best able to make any kind of collaboration work; random choice of personnel--whether leaders or participants--is least likely to serve as the best procedure to pick participants in a partnership. But professor-teacher collaborations are vital instruments of educational reform.

PROSHANSKY:

The concept and implementation of School/College Faculty Alliances is indeed a superb endeavor. The need for those who teach the young to develop a sense of self-esteem in their professional roles is fundamantal to educational progress. The continuing interaction of teacher and college faculty can contribute significantly to the morale and competence of those

who carry the burden of instruction in America's schools.

There are inherent limitations in this program, however, that must be overcome whenever these pedagogical collaborations are instituted:

1. No matter how carefully school and college teachers are brought together to meet on an equal basis insofar as status and subject matter are concerned, particularly those selected from the same discipline, the level of knowledge and understanding of subject will differ considerably. We have to monitor the collaborative process so that committed teachers will not be "put off" and frustrated by the advanced academic accomplishments of college professors.
2. Those teachers from primary and secondary schools who are motivated to join and work with colleges represent self-selected groups. What about teachers who do not need or believe that such an alliance will be useful?
3. The suggestion of giving school teachers (or for that matter college faculty as well) credits or other tangible rewards for their extramural efforts as described by Gaudiani, should be categorically avoided. The motivation to be involved in such alliances must be intrinsic.
4. Last, but by no means least, is the need to keep in mind that the essence of the master teacher is twofold in nature: knowledge of subject matter and the ability to communicate that knowledge in ways that are compatible with the age and preparation of the learner. Many college faculty may meet the first requirement, but by no means can

serve as a model for the second. The growth of teacher self-esteem through increasing knowledge of one's subject matter is necessary, but it is not sufficient for pedagogical success.

I am not convinced that the alliance approach will work as well for mastery in teaching as it can for mastery of the knowledge in one's field or discipline. We should never disregard the importance of teaching competence by itself to the successful school-based program.

APPROPRIATE INVOLVEMENT: PRIVATE GRANTMAKING AND SCHOOL REFORM

Eugene R. Wilson
President
ARCO Foundation

ARCO's introduction to school reform began in 1980, before it had become a movement. Prior to that time, only a handful of private foundations and almost no corporations were paying much attention to what had been happening in the public schools. Some companies, including ARCO, had begun an adopt-a-school effort, but most were unaware of the deeper need for change, or how they should be appropriately involved.

ARCO's enlightenment began in 1980 at a retreat for its officers who were gathered to review grantmaking priorities. Two invited guests shocked the officers with their statements about the crisis in public education: Ernest Boyer, who had just become President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, following his term as Commissioner of Education, and Bart Giamatti, who had just become President of Yale University. Like most corporate foundations, ARCO had been focusing its grantmaking solely on higher education, primarily private higher education. But Boyer and Giamatti warned that unless corporations and private foundations, and all of society, began to pay serious attention to the erosion of the quality of education in the public elementary and secondary schools, there was no assurance that America could continue to expect to have colleges and universities worthy of the name.

The result of that meeting was ARCO's single largest commitment for Boyer's study of "The High School." Our support also provided for an

action program of grants for high schools throughout the country that proposed to test one or more of the specific recommendations for school improvement which had been made by Boyer's National Panel. The grant program was administered by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and attracted proposals from 1,900, or more than 10 percent, of the public high schools in the nation. That experience had a profound effect on the ARCO Foundation's priorities for grantmaking because it generated in our foundation staff and senior corporate management a missionary zeal to try to get other corporations and private foundations to become involved in public education issues.

More and more grantmaking institutions have since indicated a willingness to consider school improvement programs, especially following the report A Nation at Risk (1983). But today, after a few years of intensified grantmaking for school reform initiatives, and what some consider considerable wasted private resources, several of those who have merely tested the public school waters have since withdrawn for various reasons. Still other corporations and private foundations have refused to consider support for public school improvement, choosing instead to concentrate on the more traditional, "safe," and often more immediately satisfying needs of higher education.

Many grantmakers who reject public schools as a grantmaking concern give two fundamental reasons for their rejection: The first is that their grantmaking resources are far too limited to have any possible effect on the enormous issues which require attention in the schools, however serious and legitimate those issues may be. The second, and more pervasive reason, is that public education should be a public concern to be addressed by public

policy makers and resolved by public resources. They conclude that private grantmaking has no appropriate role to play in solving such intractable public problems.

The latter argument is more difficult to win because all private donors, both corporations and private foundations, recognize that even collectively, their grants will not solve any of the issues faced by public education. Unfortunately, however, many public education leaders in the schools and in policy-making responsibilities continue to believe that private grant resources can be counted on for long-term support for ongoing school needs. Such is not the case.

In fact, too many school leaders, and all types of public officials, have been seduced by the partnership concept. They seem to define ideal partnerships as their ideas and needs being funded by corporation and private foundation grants. But this broad interpretation of the concept of partnership is folly.

Partnership is not simply "their" ideas and "our" grants. To pursue this misperception of partnership is to demonstrate a basic lack of understanding of the appropriate role of private philanthropy in American society. The best use of private sector resources has been and will continue to be the identification of pressing educational, social, and cultural problems, then using those private resources to test a few model solutions to those problems that can effect positive change. But broad implementation of solutions and real systematic change will continue to depend on public support.

This public support can only result from courageous and enlightened public policy leaders, both elected and appointed, who are willing to put themselves on the line with the voters to insure that the most urgent

public priorities receive the greatest public resources, and who indicate where trade-offs for increased public support will be required or where additional public resources can be justified. Private sector leaders can assist, enable, and inform, or even goad, as in the case of the Minnesota and California Roundtable initiatives, but public leaders still must take charge to serve the public in bringing about long-term change. In other words, corporations and private foundations have come to the realization that their private resources will be best used to help reshape public priorities by funding successful examples. Implementation of these examples on the board scale must be the function of public leadership supported by public resources.

The need for structural reform of public education is a good case in point. Those of us who have become students of school reform issues continue to seek understanding of where our private resources might best be appropriately targeted, and what kinds of public school involvements will be most effective, not just for marginal improvement. In this case, private support has been called the "R & D" of school reform.

Volumes and volumes have been generated by many informed authors that are full of options for private grants. Yet grantmakers continue to be besieged with "outstanding opportunities" for spending grants on someone's brainchild that really should be publicly funded. Too many such requests miss the fundamental point of the appropriate use of private resources. These proposals seem to arrive on our desks because we have become perceived as "soft-touch partners," certainly easier to reach than are resources through the normal, public appropriations process. Too many educators seem encouraged by private sector interest in school reform and believe,

mistakenly, that grantmakers are now eager and willing to use dollars for programs that should be publicly supported. Corporations and private foundations cannot and should not be expected to use their limited, private funds to support ordinary programs that local, state, or federal governmental agencies may recognize as needs, but choose not to fund.

So where can we direct our corporate and private foundation colleagues and educators who would like to test these waters of "appropriate involvement," but do not know where to begin? Our practice is to familiarize them with H. L. "Bud" Hodgkinson's demographic analyses. His reports since 1983 from the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) have had as profound an effect on our thinking as did Boyer's and Giamatti's in 1980. Every time we bring Hodgkinson's message before another group of corporate or foundation people, they express stunned disbelief at the implications of the demographic shifts taking place in our country and in our schools.

Hodgkinson's statement that "...the future is here today, but we have to learn to see it" is as compelling as "...the future is but the past--come home to haunt us." His work describing a group of minority and disadvantaged students helps us recognize our own self-interest. At ARCO, we have used his interpretation of demographic data to convince our senior management to allow us to revise all of our grantmaking priorities to correspond to the realities that Hodgkinson projects. Based on our belief in the continued importance of his work, we have helped recently to create the new Center for Demographic Policy under the IEL umbrella. We are confident that this new Center will have significant influence on education leaders and policy makers at all levels, and on grantmakers, as the school

reform movement continues to evolve.

Another outstanding resource for identifying "bullseye" opportunities for corporations and private foundations in school reform is the Committee for Economic Development. Their two landmark reports, Investing in Our Children (1986) and Children in Need (1987), provide nearly all the understanding required for a grantmaker to recognize the urgency for school reform, the underlying causes, the implications if these issues are ignored, and effective strategies for meaningful private sector involvement.

Any grantmaker who expresses a desire to become involved in school reform issues must know about these basic resources. From that understanding, the existing bibliography is seemingly endless if a deeper knowledge is sought about the hidden or finer aspects of structural reform: poverty; female single parents; early childhood development; language; parent involvement; at-risk students and the consequences of early failure; factors of ethnic variation in urban school peformance; availability of quality facilities and teachers; teacher recruitment and credentialing; master teacher career ladders; union-management conflict; youth community service and leadership development; school-site management and accountability; choice/competition; mentoring; the school site as community social center; workforce readiness; school-to-work transition; intergenerational contact; and a disinterested aging society.

We are pleased to observe that other major corporations and private foundations are slowly but surely recognizing that they, too, should consider the problems and opportunities represented by these demographic shifts. In fact, the Pre-collegiate Education Group of the Council on Foundations has grown from 15 interested grantmakers in 1969 to 56 today,

with over 250 on its mailing list. Although corporations direct more than 40 percent of their contributed dollars to education, higher education receives 90 percent of this amount, with only 10 percent awarded for pre-college programs. The percent for pre-college, however, is growing at the expense of support for higher education and human service programs, and a major new thrust by Fortune magazine to focus business attention on the need for public school reform should expedite this increase.

All grantmakers are seeking to sharpen the focus of their grants, whatever their program interests, to achieve maximum results. We encourage them especially to look for "rifle shot" opportunities in public schools or even earlier, rather than continuing to pursue traditional grantmaking only for higher education, museums, symphonies, and similar "safe" needs.

We also encourage corporations and private foundations to insist on outcomes from their grants. Our grantmaking must be recognized as an investment, not a "give away." Too often private grantmakers have been persuaded to support school reform programs that address legitimate needs, but lack any indication on the part of the schools that the grant will make a real difference in leading to long-term solution of a priority issue. David Kearns, CEO of Xerox, and Dennis Doyle, of the Hudson Institute, caution us to avoid what they call "feel good" projects in school reform. We concur, and suggest as a place to start, the many noteworthy examples of structural change that do involve appropriate private-sector involvements. "Outcomes Management" must drive our judgment about where to award our limited private resources.

In business and in grantmaking, we look for "bottom-line" results. We must insist on a return on our philanthropic investments. In school

reform, the lack of immediate bottom-line results may deter skeptical grantmakers from ever becoming involved. Much of the difficulty in identifying appropriate private sector involvement lies in making the transition from generalizations to specifics, from good theory to successful implementation. But all available data confirm that the ultimate loss of human capital, if present circumstances are ignored, far outweighs the present cost/investment necessary for school improvement.

R E A C T O R S

Anne S. Alexander
Vice President, Education Programs
AT&T Foundation

Peter C. Hutchinson
Vice President, External Affairs
Dayton Hudson Corporation and
Chairman, Dayton Hudson Foundation

Paul M. Ostergard
President
General Electric Foundation

ALEXANDER:

I represent a company that, just as Eugene Wilson has described in the case of ARCO, is grappling with what we can do with our relatively modest philanthropic resources to make a real difference in the school reform area. I want to reinforce Mr. Wilson's identification of the central issue for grantmakers of determining just what is "appropriate involvement."

The primary emphasis of the AT&T Foundation has been on science and engineering in higher education. In the past, most of AT&T's work in the pre-college field has been people-based: mentoring and volunteering by AT&T employees, ranging from assisting math and science teachers in developing curriculum materials to giving talks in classrooms, to providing summer lab experience for teachers and students, to after-school tutoring. In addition, the AT&T Foundation is currently supporting a few pre-college reform or intervention programs. The process involved in this kind of philanthropy is very different from that of awarding grants to MIT or Stanford.

First and foremost, collaboration with the lower schools involves a different timeline; time is needed for building trust among the various partners around the table: school administrators, teachers, community leaders, unions, business people, or university people. Simply convening a group around a project can be a challenge.

Secondly, it is clear that business and private foundations cannot and should not impose neat solutions on different localities. What we must do is work to identify the creative and effective leaders and agencies in a particular locality and support those efforts.

It is worthwhile to reiterate Eugene Wilson's point about current

misunderstandings about the term "partnership." Partnerships must involve commitments of resources from all parties key to the project's success, not just the official philanthropic agency. The goal of private philanthropy must be to support good ideas and models that have the potential to become part of normal school budgets, part of a new way of doing business that directs all energies of the system to the interaction between teachers and students in the classroom.

HUTCHINSON:

It may be that revolutionary change is required to reform education. This is already happening in American business. In this sense, education partnerships are only tangential to school reform. Nonetheless, a business-school collaboration can serve to give an institutional setting to our best convictions.

There are important lessons to be learned from educational partnerships. In each instance, these ideas may represent no more than common sense applications of what works well in any community endeavor. Partnerships are distinctive when:

- mistrust, ignorance, and insecurity have been checked at the front door;
- a vision of success has been developed that is focused and accepted by all participants;
- commitment is a principle chosen over efficiency;
- progress is accepted in place of what might be an impossible goal of perfection;

- generous impulses and leveraged resources become dependable collaboration supports.

I believe we should celebrate the private grantmaking that Eugene Wilson endorses for the ARCO Foundation. What should never be missed is the larger agenda of social change and profound reform necessary to make our public schools better.

OSTERGARD:

Eugene Wilson's paper raises the question of what has happened to American education in the last five years. The encouraging news is that since A Nation at Risk (1983), a number of reforms have been launched in many of the nation's 16,000 school districts. The sad news is that surveys made, since the report, indicate the toughest work has yet to be done:

- In a comparison among 13 countries (1983-86), American high school youngsters scored lowest in biology, third lowest in chemistry, and fifth lowest in physics.
- Three other studies show our highest scoring fifth graders below all Japanese tested; our eighth graders scored 10th out of 20 nations in arithmetic.

The situation of our nation's academic decline is compounded by a school-age population that is smaller and larger in its mix of minorities than was the case when the "baby boom" generation was in school. In New York State, minorities in public schools comprise 32 percent of the student population; in Florida, 33 percent; in California, 43 percent; in Texas, 46 percent. We know the educational disadvantages of our minority

populations threaten the progress achieved in school reform throughout the nation.

To fill the gap between the demands of highly sophisticated jobs and the future supply of educated and technically trained people, we must expand the pool of college-bound youngsters. That will be impossible unless we are also able to increase college-going rates among the nation's minorities.

Beginning in 1970, General Electric and other major companies made a concerted effort to dramatically increase the number of minority engineers in the United States. That effort has since helped to triple minority engineering graduates and is one of the success stories in minority advancement. To build on this corporate momentum requires a growing pool of youngsters prepared for college. The fact is that although numbers of high school minority graduates are increasing, college enrollments among minorities are falling.

There are three major obstacles that must be overcome to increase minority participation in higher education. The first is financial aid. Government, universities, and the private sector can assure that adequate funding is available to finance tomorrow's scholars through a mix of grants, loans, and incentives for savings. General Electric, as a major funder of minority scholarships, can be counted on to continue to play a leading role with other key players to make sure no mind is wasted for lack of funding.

The second obstacle is one that must be overcome by college administrators, with both public and private help. Universities must recruit more minority faculty. Of our nation's engineering faculty of 21,800, only 200 are Black, 300 are Hispanic, and 400 are women. It is clear that

universities must focus on this issue to fill slots vacated by attrition within the aging professoriate and to keep step with the changing composition of student bodies.

On this point, the General Electric Foundation has launched a fifteen million dollar program to help universities build "Faculties for the Future." Ten million dollars will be devoted to doubling minority faculty in science, engineering, and business over the next decade; five million dollars will be devoted to increase significantly female faculty in these same disciplines. Based on the Foundation's successful fifteen million dollar "Program for the 1980's" which helped some 1,200 Ph.D.'s to enter college teaching, we believe a similar program targeted to minorities and women is ambitious, but achievable. It will have to take into account relatively few minorities at the bachelor level and stiff competition from industry for emerging minority engineers and scientists. The program will feature first year graduate fellowships, forgivable loans for second and third year studies (forgiven if recipients go into teaching), and young faculty grants to help new college teachers gain stature in their fields.

A final point, the shrinking pool of college-ready youngsters in our secondary schools will be the biggest challenge. We can no longer afford to turn our backs on poor and inner-city public schools. We tell youngsters in General Electric Foundation programs, "If you can dream it, you can do it." Now we are taking some of our own advice. We have also just launched a twenty million dollar effort to double the number of college-bound students at selected poor and inner city public schools by the year 2000.

We urge other foundations and companies to join us, as well as school volunteers.

SUCCESSFUL EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS IN AMERICA

Theodore L. Gross
President
Roosevelt University

As we approach the end of the eighties, the decade will largely be remembered, educationally, by the varying responses to the warning that America is a nation at risk. We have admired those governors who have worked to strengthen the role of teachers in their individual states; we have witnessed the former Secretary of Education give academic affairs a prominence--some would say notoriety--on the American agenda; and we have seen educators publish best-selling books and reports that are read by a nation of concerned citizens as well as by professional educators.

No one doubts that we are a nation at risk, and the educational responses to the indictment of 1983, issued by the National Commission on Excellence, are gratifying. If we search for an overriding theme that underlies the scattered solutions to school reform, surely it is the realization that educators cannot improve our schools alone. Today, teacher and businessman, professor and school teacher, government and community leader, school administrator and union leader have met in educational partnerships that often transcend special interests. The record of the eighties is mixed, and collaborations of schools, colleges, businesses, government, and the community have had varying degrees of success; but the dominant record of the decade is one of partnership. We have finally begun to answer Henry Morrison Clinton's criticism, expressed in 1923: "As a people, we do not think in terms of education; we think in

terms of schools. We have no educational system; we have an elementary school, a high school, and a college."

The most pervasive and influential program for accelerating students into college work has been the Advanced Placement Program. Begun in 1956 by twelve colleges and twelve high schools, it allowed students to study college-level courses in their own schools and take standard, national examinations that are prepared by the Educational Testing Service under the sponsorship of the College Board. These examinations are scored on a rising scale of achievement from one to five, and the results are sent to those colleges that the students plan to attend. The colleges then determine whether the students are to be advanced to higher levels of instruction. Advanced placement has been institutionalized in American education and has, for the most part, proved to be successful; it is one of the few programs that bridge college and high school work without threatening the schools, and it has had a tonic effect on other courses in the curriculum.

The list of programs that provide intellectual stimulation and college credits for gifted high school students has grown each year in the past three decades. These endeavors include projects underway across the entire nation, with emphases that span the entire curriculum of math, science, and the humanities; such diverse institutions as Columbia University, Westinghouse Corporation, and the Berkeley California School district have developed educational collaborations of remarkable quality. In each instance adaptations of the original idea behind Advance Placement suggest the eagerness of universities, businesses, local schools systems, and many state legislatures to encourage the brightest youth to realize their talent.

Partnerships relating to teacher training have been slow to develop.

Dr. Claire Gaudiani's Academic Alliance, the subject of a fine presentation at this conference, is a recent example of a collaboration based on the commonality of professional commitment by teachers and college professors who work in the same disciplines. But the major burden of developing teachers has been left to schools of education, and there has been relatively little professional interaction between college faculty and their school counterparts through the initiative of liberal arts colleges.

One of the most prominent and certainly most successful efforts at teacher training has been the Bay Area Writing project (now called the National Writing Project), initiated by James Gray of the School of Education at Berkeley in 1973, and still coordinated by him. The core of the program is teacher training. There is a five-week invitational summer institution with clear aims: "to provide teachers with a setting in which they can share classroom successes, to make teachers more conscious of the grounds of their own teaching and to help them broaden those grounds, to give teachers an opportunity to commit themselves intensely and reflectively to writing, and finally to identify and train a corps of master classroom teachers who can effectively teach other teachers the techniques of teaching writing." During the year there are "ten three-hour workshops on the teaching of writing at individual schools and districts." The entire project depends heavily on "university and community college faculty members and elementary and secondary school teachers [working] together as colleagues and partners."

Compared to teacher training and even Advanced Placement, a list of community-based educational partnerships would comprise a book itself. They exist in many communities throughout the country and testify to the growing significance of this movement. The more dramatic examples

have developed in New Haven and Boston, and in a program for dropout prevention, Cities-in-Schools, that is now gaining in momentum.

In 1978, Yale University organized the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute in conjunction with the local school system. This Institute conducts seminars in a broad range of liberal arts subjects for approximately eighty teachers in the high schools. They take place from March to July and involve curriculum development as well as continuing education for the teachers. Funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute has been able to pay teachers a $650 stipend. It has also opened university facilities to them and allowed them a professional life they would not otherwise have. So successful has the program been in the New Haven schools that fifty city businesses have subsequently provided supporting funds.

The desegregation plan set forth in 1976 by Federal Judge W. Arthur Garrity, Jr., led to the establishment of an educational partnership in Boston--a city that for a time was particularly tense with racial distrust and animosity. Called the Boston School-College Collaboration, it originally ordered the pairing of Boston schools with colleges and universities to improve educational programs in a school system that now includes more than 56,000 elementary, middle, and high school students. In 1975, the colleges and universities signed an agreement to raise the college acceptance rate of Boston Public School graduates 25 percent by 1989. Although the results were mixed initially and colleges were slow to participate, by the 1983-84 school year it was estimated that the colleges and universities had contributed to the Boston school system a combination of scholarships, services, time, and materials worth $5.6 million.

These programs represent a selection from the most successful community based partnerships within the past thirty years and are a permanent part of the landscape of learning in America. It is not accidental that they begin with accelerated educational opportunities in individual disciplines for students, turn toward an emphasis on teacher training, and then involve the entire community. Two other collaborations need to be described, for they embrace the finest features of previous projects and point the way to what I believe must become the structure and purpose of educational partnerships in the future: The SUNY Westchester School Partnership, with which I have been personally affiliated, and the Center for Educational Renewal, directed by John Goodlad at the University of Washington.

The SUNY Purchase Westchester School Partnership was established in 1983 by eleven school districts and the State University of New York at Purchase, with five-year funding from the American Can Company (now Primerica) of $400,000. The steering committee of eleven superintendents and four college administrators was chaired by the dean of liberal arts and sciences--there was no formal program in education at this liberal arts college--and set in motion a wide variety of programs. The first was a Math/Science Resource and Computer Training Center, funded by the State Education Department, concentrating on elementary science. The second was an extensive program of weeklong institutes in chemistry, mathematics, physics, writing and other disciplines, sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation; within three years, more than 500 teachers participated in institutes of 30 teachers each, with extensive follow-up sessions throughout the academic year. The third was Project WELD

(Workshops for Educator Leadership Development), modeled after IBM's Education Executive Program and administered initially by Loaned Executives who had organized the IBM program; this led to a Center for Leadership Development. Other programs included an Institute in Motivation, a Fellowship Program for Guidance Counselors, a Center for Economic Education, a Freshman Great Books course for gifted high school seniors, a program for retired executives, and an extensive project for dropout prevention. In each case, the program was a local adaptation of a successful national model.

The important point, finally, to make about the SUNY Purchase Westchester School Partnership--a project close to my heart, since I was the dean and chairperson of the steering committee and saw it grow from eleven to thirty-one school districts within five years--is that it was a genuine educational collaboration, involving a university and local school districts with the State Education Department and government agencies, corporations and businesses, and community agencies. It became more than a program for accelerated or at-risk students; more than teacher-training institutes; more than an outreach to the community. It became the sum of all these parts.

Perhaps the most ambitious and elaborate college-school collaboration in the country has been initiated by John Goodlad. His National Network for Educational Renewal is headquartered at the University of Washington, with initial funding from the Exxon Education and Danforth foundations. Goodlad and his colleagues are seeking ways to improve upon "the education of educators."

His five-year program focuses on three interrelated areas: (1) "a study of 1,300 schools, colleges, and departments of education in the nation to determine the current conditions surrounding the education of

educators"; (2) "an examination of the preparation programs of other professions such as medicine, law, engineering, architecture, and the arts . . . to determine those practices--both past and present--that might lead to a better understanding of new ways to develop models of educator preparation"; and (3) "the development of some twelve (now thirteen) partnerships of school districts and universities, each with a focus on the simultaneous improvement of both preparation and practice, and the development of a national network to link these partnerships in common reseach and school improvement efforts."

Thirteen local partnerships--Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Utah, Virginia, Washington State, and Wyoming--have made a five-year commitment to the national network, which includes "a newsletter, consultants, periodic national meetings of the partnerships' executive directors, and the creation of six or seven national task forces on specific reform topics."

We no longer have to make the case for the concept of college, school, and business collaborations. They are a reality in virtually every community. The directory that the American Association for Higher Education has recently published, with more than 1,000 collaborative enterprises catalogued, indicates the power of the movement. Many of these efforts are modest: adopt-a-school programs between businesses and schools, college courses for high school students, corporate funding of special programs. But others are much more ambitious. Many have gone far beyond the experimental stage and are reforming the landscape of learning in America.

Although the government initiated the first wave of reform by establishing a Commission on Excellence, which issued A Nation at Risk in

1983, it has not really pursued the recommendations of that report aggressively. There has not been focused leadership on a sustained basis. Educational reform has been left to the states and has often been effective; but one can make a compelling case that the moment has arrived for federal legislation in support of educational partnerships. Just as the establishment of the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts has resulted in significant strengthening of the fields they represent, a federal program for college-school collaboration would give national leadership to the many collaborations that have developed from local need and could have, as part of its mandate, challenge grants to businesses, communities, schools and, especially, colleges. It could draft its mandate so that colleges and universities become leading force in fostering educational partnerships.

We can already see the future direction of educational partnerships. That future rests primarily with colleges and universities willing to assert leadership in initiating these partnerships, including those formed with leading American corporations. Emerging from enlightened self-interest, educational partnerships have already become a necessity in most localities--chosen, not mandated, and offering the powerful promise of reform. Wisely organized, a partnership strengthens each culture it encompasses--college, school, business, community, and government--and creates a new and broader culture of mutual concern for the improvement of learning in America. It has taken two hundred years for the country to reach this beginning, but the future of education is now a partnership for the entire society to share. It is our mutual estate.

R E A C T O R S

Stephen R. Aiello
Executive Vice President and
Director of Public Affairs
Burson-Marsteller

Wayne Carlson
Director of Partnership Programs
Los Angeles Unified School District

Franklin P. Wilbur
Director, Project Advance
Syracuse University

AIELLO:

One of the advantages I gained by my service as President of the New York City Board of Education was my realization that listening to people, whether teachers or superintendents, was a way of learning about the schools. Improvements in education are possible whenever the practical standards of pedagogical success become standards of application throughout the educational system. The same lessons are foundations for an effective business-school partnership. We need only reflect on this burgeoning national experience to select those criteria which predict success.

Probably the best collaborations are launched when business and school partners have learned to trust each other and have been involved as co-equals in developing any particular enterprise from its inception. Just as important are clear definitions of partnership goals as well as a comprehensive strategy, with realistic expectations, designed to bring about demonstrable gains in educational outcomes. Each educational collaboration also requires a long-term commitment by the parties in order to insure that experimental endeavors have an adequate chance to succeed. A last element characteristic of a dynamic educational partnership is a "spiritual leader," an individual capable of inspiring all the participants, who is able by force of personality and principle to guarantee the collaboration's integrity. The successful program must combine each of these criteria to achieve strategic and measurable improvements in our schools.

CARLSON:

Partnerships for students are real life applications to education and the world of work. The crisis in public education has engendered enumerable examples of collaborations to assist schools in every section of the United States. Theodore Gross' stimulating paper describes the long history of "successful" partnerships, especially those that center on gifted students and involve academic-credit projects with colleges and universities.

We have learned that the names we give to partnership programs are not as important as the collaborating process and its results. Partnerships are more than good public relations or activities that make people "feel good." They are essential for business as well as education. As program practitioners, it is important that we create an environment where the understanding and trust that comes from partnerships evolve into greater commitments and broader results; it is also important that as partners we keep one another informed of critical issues so that together we might develop programs and activities to address these issues and validate program activities and outcomes.

As a result of this conference, we have learned about many successful partnerships. An important step in helping to institutionalize the concept would be the inclusion of the "Why" and "How" of partnerships as a subject in the teacher training curriculums across the country. These courses could be easily constructed with a significant field-based component. We should miss no opportunity to expand, refine, and assess the partnership movement which has proven to be mutually essential and beneficial to all involved.

WILBUR:

There is no single education system in the United States. Thousands of school districts everywhere in the country exhibit countless varieties of governance, with an even greater multiplicity of funding sources. This is why each school partnership must focus on a particular goal and place. Collaboration will succeed when its objectives and institutional setting are mutually reinforcing.

What will not succeed are those partnerships that fail to achieve legitimacy from an endorsement by educational leaders. We have learned that high level inspiration, especially within school and university collaboratives, make each institution take seriously the educational engagement that most partnerships require. Similarly, partnerships which receive initial resources have to be concerned with long-term funding of those educational innovations that collaborations develop. My own research also suggests that partnerships are too often obstructed by red tape and bureaucratic administration, practices which represent devotion to academic forms over commitments to those working relationships that make educational reform possible. There should be sufficient recognition and reward built into the typical collaborative to reinforce the partnership process.

My major contribution to the study of collaborations is the publication of the National Directory of School-College Partnerships (1988), a showcase of the leading programs created in the last twenty years. Though the partnership movement has received some attention in recent books by Ernest Boyer and Gene Maeroff, my work with co-authors Leo M. Lambert and M. Jean Young was designed to describe the most prominent school-college partnerships and create an electronic data base at Syracuse University on

every ongoing project. Our published directory is a guide composed of brief abstracts, an alphabetical listing of leading programs, and complete identification of each partnership described in the volume, as well as an invitation to use the data base for further information about the hundreds of collaboratives we discovered. The National Directory will promote the contribution of partnerships to educational reform by opening up its recent experience to scholarly research.

In conclusion, I want to note two special partnership "subjects." One of the most rapidly growing college-business collaborations is in the area of technology, particularly those projects sometimes formalized in contractual relationships in which training programs are developed to introduce new employees to the latest technologies. I also contend we will see tremendous growth in education-social service collaborations as a result of welfare reform, the immediate instance being the recently imposed federal mandate for the education of welfare recipients. It is regretable that insufficient attention is being paid by superintendents and college administrators to their special role in this novel undertaking. Business also can share responsibility for the training of the welfare population by identifying needs and priorities for people who rarely succeeded in their former schooling. We will learn best about the real value of partnerships when we extend their reach into entirely new social objectives.

SCHOOL/BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM TWO RESEARCH PROJECTS

Tom Smith
Vice President and
Director of External Affairs
Public/Private Ventures

Interest in collaborations between schools and businesses will likely grow over the next decade as demographic forces, particularly those affecting entry-level youth, are increasingly felt in the workplace. Not only is the number of youth declining, both in absolute and relative terms as a fraction of the population and particularly as a fraction of the workforce, but also the fraction of disadvantaged, marginally employable youth is increasing.

Public/Private Ventures' conclusions about the potential and results of school/business partnerships derive from two projects: a two-year assessment of collaborations chosen for their relative stability and for their focus on disadvantaged youngsters (findings from which are reported in Allies in Education, Philadelphia, 1988); and a more recent Public/Private Ventures study of seven "Compact Replication" projects undertaken by the National Alliance of Business.

The collaborations we studied can be classified broadly into three types:

- "Systemic" partnerships, of which the Boston Compact is perhaps the most widely know example; these focus, by design, on effecting broad-scale changes in the way education is conducted;

- "Single-purpose" projects, which are aimed typically at improving employability or enhancing workplace linkages in schools;
- "Adopt-a-School" projects, which are pairings between individual businesses and schools, and aim to provide a broad range of benefits to schools.

Program officials sometimes exaggerate their claims; many programs that Public/Private Ventures reviewed for the Allies project proved too insubstantial to warrant serious scrutiny. In the nine we selected, though, businesses made substantial contributions of money, time, staff, effort, and equipment.

The benefits we found in these initiatives were for the most part tangible, though limited in extent: greater access to jobs, particularly for disadvantaged youth who might not otherwise have been reached; increased personal attention, including, mentoring and special classes; coaching and preparation for job finding and workplace behavior; and upgraded physical plant, extra resources, increased morale, and a more knowledgeable constituency for public education.

In the larger context, which takes into account not only the research reported in Allies but our examination of the Compact Replication sites and a broader assessment of the field, we arrive at the following conclusions:

1. There is little agreement on the specific aims school/business partnerships should seek to attain. Broadly, everyone agrees on the need for improved educational performance and a better "product" from the schools. Although some take this to signal the need for systemic change, a far more common interpretation of the call is

for general "school improvement," a far weaker expression under which many quite small and limited partnerships can, and do, claim success.

2. School/business collaborations have thus far been augmentations of, rather than alternatives to, what is already in place. Too many programs are one-time, short-term, and serve limited numbers of schools and youth, hardly equal to the long-term, complex, and pervasive problems schools and the educational system face.

3. The most ambitious "systemic" initiatives have usually been long on rhetoric and process, and short on recognizably effective actions. Ambitious goals and a process of collaboration are important, to be sure, but are no substitute for clear ideas about what to do. No specific prescriptions have yet emerged that offer much promise of bringing about the broad-scale changes that school/business partnerships espouse. This deficiency is critical, for the need to "deliver" on promises and rhetoric will surely grow more acute over time. Unless recognizably effective mechanisms to change and improve education emerge, the school/business approach will likely come to be viewed as an oversold idea, and it will languish.

4. Most of the accomplishments of the collaborations we studied have emanated from the business side, in the form of jobs, staff, monetary and other resources. The schools have been for the most part recipients; their role has been largely

passive, producing few tangible steps of their own.

5. Knowledge about educational processes is asymmetrically distributed in most partnerships. Business people willingly involve themselves in specifying "measurable" bottom-line objectives, but all too frequently have little sense of how schools can or will go about accomplishing them. The reluctance to get more deeply involved is understandable: business people are not educators, and do not wish to be. Yet so long as the business half of these partnerships remains at a distance from the educational process itself, substantive changes in the way education goes about its business are likely to be limited, and perhaps insignificant.

Despite these sobering observations, we nonetheless also conclude that these partnerships have real potential to effect change. The best of them have thus far served a limited but quite pivotal function as catalysts for raising and discussing educational issues of importance, and heightening awareness, particularly in the private sector, of the need for change and improvement. The key problem, we believe, is in finding tangible courses of action, the critical next step in the evolution of these partnerships.

Given these conclusions, we find the future of these collaborations difficult to forecast. No suitable paradigm has emerged to guide and encourage the field. Nor is it a simple matter to frame an agenda of study and research that will be both timely and elucidating. Our work leads us to conclude that successful partnerships should be judged on the basis of six relatively simple elements which, if present, argue for the likelihood,

though by no means the certainty, of a collaboration's success:

1. A commonly accepted vision that broadly but explicitly focuses on basic school changes; and a concept that articulates practical steps to bring these changes about;
2. Leadership that has clout, consistency, and duration; at least from the schools and business side, such leadership is essential; a similar commitment from other local government can be a substantial boon as well;
3. Review mechanisms that can frankly assess plans, activities, problems, and results, and can serve as a lever to maintain pressure for change and improvement;
4. Change managers, from both business and the schools, whose task is not to administer but to work dynamically and entrepreneurially to make things happen; the presence or absence of such individuals is a critical test of commitment on the part of the participants;
5. Institutionalization, not of programs and procedures but of the focus on ideas and salutary change;
6. A process that encourages openness, attracts support for the collaboration's goals, and helps to sustain movement toward attainment of those goals.

These suggestions provide standards by which to predict the success of school/business collaborations in the future. There exists no single model of a "best" working partnership. Our goal must be to develop effective measures of performance so as to maximize the investment of resources among a growing universe of school and business educational ventures.

R E A C T O R S

Marsha Levine
Associate Director, Educational Issues
American Federation of Teachers

Richard J. Shavelson
Dean, Graduate School of Education
University of California-Santa Barbara

Michael D. Usdan
President
Institute for Educational Leadership

LEVINE:

Evaluations of public-private partnerships in education, focused on at-risk youth, indicate that little systemic change can be associated with such activity. That this should be the case is not surprising. Most business-school collaboration to date has been concerned with improving already existing school programs, or augmenting those which exist with additional activities. Created during the initial waves of education reform, these partnerships reflect the narrow way in which the problems of school failure are often approached. Typically, solutions have been sought through doing the same things better and/or in greater number. Evaluations, such as those done by Tom Smith's Public/Private Ventures, are forcing attention on the need to use a broader lens to look at educational problems. We have to question the most basic, and often unexamined, premises which govern the nation's schooling.

The evolution of educational reform suggests a new, two-pronged strategy for partnerships. Partnerships should reflect the recognition that education is but one universal problem which besets the children and youth of this country. Partnerhips ought to consider broadening their scope to include various community and health organizations, as well as businesses, schools, and universities.

Future partnerships also need to be driven by a shared vision of learning, grounded in what we know about how children learn and how learning takes place outside of school. Partnerships should not compensate for school weakness; they need to concentrate on building school strengths. They can begin to do this by focusing on programs which change the nature

of the learning experience in schools. These challenges to current practices are the basis of a restructuring of American schools and hold the best promise of reform and progress.

SHAVELSON:

I am pleased that Tom Smith's presentation struck a refreshing note of reality. The impact of partnerships, or, for that matter, most educational innovations, pales by comparison to what needs to get accomplished.

Building on Smith's paper, I would like to extend his arguments regarding the evaluation of school and business collaborations:

First, the effects of education are small compared to the effects of poverty, language difference, cultural difference, and just plain individual difference.

Second, the goals set for partnerships should be realistic. Consequently, they should be modest, not only because many more factors than instruction or administration affect student outcomes, but also because of the amount of effort institutions with different charters have to put into the enterprise. As Claire Gaudiani pointed out in her presentation, the intersection of common interests among schools, universities, foundations, and businesses is a slim one; small partnership effects should be celebrated.

Third, there is good evidence, some of it presented there, to suggest that education can make a significant impact on the quality of human talent; intensive work with individual, at-risk students by teachers, parents, and community members can turn the tide. Yet the waste of talent

is staggering. After spending time with so-called at-risk students, I am becoming convinced that "at riskness" reflects more on society than on the individual concerned, and that our society is losing significant talent very early in the pipeline.

Fourth, while we are working at the margins of school improvement, progress will not be made until we re-examine what this nation takes as evidence of success in education in general, and in partnerships specifically. To reform education, we need a new testing technology, a technology that will measure real knowledge and problem-solving ability, as well as factual-recall ability of the school population.

I am not so radical as some critics in calling for an educational revolution, but a significant shake up is certainly in order, as is a major societal commitment to education and all of those interacting systems that impinge on education. I am not sanguine about this change in the near term; it will take an economic crisis of great proportion in this country to turn the tide. Only then will the country react. Maybe then, rather than pointing the finger at each other, the public and private sector will unite in allocating the resources needed to educate the remarkable diversity of students in our school system.

USDAN:

The partnership movement is a young and fragile aspect of educational reform. Each project is usually a "process" endeavor, an activity with partners inexperienced in working together, and therefore difficult to measure. It is important not to oversell individual collaborations. Too

often, before they are able to establish themselves, the "quick-fix" mentality that often prevails in education takes charge and demands immediate results. A reasoned evaluation of partnerships still requires the passage of time.

The cultural differences between the life of business and the nature of schools is a reason for all participants to take special care in the development of educational partnerships. The political support of business is not yet solidified; we must guard against premature judgments from public sector leaders. We must also take care not to oversell our expectations of partnerships. The repeated advise at this conference about clear and limited goals is essential for successful experimentation.

We should not expect strong initiatives from school boards and school bureaucracies in promoting collaborations. The political-educational leadership of many urban school districts has been seriously challenged in recent decades and is somewhat defensive about new participants in the educational governance process. Nonetheless, the existing governance structure does provide what might be called the "continuity of administration" so necessary to maintain a semblance of stability in a volatile school environment. The relationship of partnerships with school board leadership requires much more attention. It reminds us that the capacity of American school governance to promote educational change is a vital public concern.

SUMMATION

Dale Mann
Center for Education and the American Economy
Teachers College, Columbia University

Partnerships have become a popular device to tie public schools to some of their constituencies. In some cities, business has replaced parents as the preferred clientele of school leaders. The results of business/school partnerships have been useful, if only marginally so. This conference added a third player--higher education institutions--to the equation.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Left to their own devices, panelists from business and the public schools discussed each other. Neither bothered to talk about what colleges or universities had done or might contribute. When they mentioned these institutions at all, they stressed how much professors could learn as a result of their involvement with public schools.

Of course, not all higher education institutions are the same. One important distinction is between those with major teacher education programs, including colleges that do not offer doctoral degrees, and the research universities. There is more to report from teacher training institutions--collaborative activities, alliances, and shared teaching--than from the research universities. The involvement of research universities in educational reform is real, but more diffused because it is expressed in the traditional academic sequence of scholarship, development, dissemination, and (eventually) utilization. No one should underestimate,

however, the vital contributions of colleges and universities to these partnerships.

BUSINESS

The most important contributions of American business to public education do not depend on partnerships. Businesses pay taxes and employ graduates. The amount of cash contributed to public school partnerships is a tiny fraction, perhaps less than half of one percent of corporate revenues; and even that is vulnerable to pressures more central to business leadership than philanthropy, such as profit-after-taxes and the market valuation of corporate worth. Business/school partnerships have provided otherwise unavailable services and some greater sympathy for the tough job of making the public schools more effective. In a few places, especially in state and municipal politics, they have matured into a political coalition in support of more taxes to public schools. (At the federal level, an opposite effect may be observed with the Reagan Administration using voluntarism as a smoke screen to cover its withdrawal of support for the public schools.) The record is one of widely noticed first steps in which the corporate community acknowledges the challenges facing public education in America.

In estimating the contribution of business to the crisis facing American public schools, however, it is important to recognize that not all businesses believe there is a crisis of public education. A better educated labor force is also more expensive to employ and less dependent on a particular firm for employment. New plants and relocated factories have been moved from states with progressive and innovative public school systems to those that are at the low end of educational accomplishment.

Although public observers are apprehensive about the political consequences and tax effect of a high tech/low tech/no tech future, in some parts of our nation that differentiation is economically efficient. In these cases, it may be that business has the urban schools that it wants.

Businesses represented in forums such as this are also a bad sample of the entire nation. Most American businesses have no philanthropic presence. To the extent that corporate America believes there is a crisis in the public schools, they have an array of options besides a commitment to educational reform. One is to get out of manufacturing businesses, to turn from creating products to churning investment paper: witness the feeding frenzy prompted by the explosion of mergers and acquisitions plus leveraged buy-outs. A second reaction is to move to a more cost-efficient labor pool, typically overseas. A third response to the lack of skills presented by public school graduates is to de-skill or "dumb-down" jobs.

An even more characteristic reaction to the perceived failure of public schools is to "do it yourself." The second largest employee cost in American business is job training. In New Jersey, only the Newark public schools spend more on education than Johnson & Johnson. Private sector education is a second school system in America; and to the extent that job training involves basic skills acquisition, it represents private employers being forced to absorb a cost for what the public schools have not done.

Our evaluation of school-business collaborations should be placed in a context that acknowledges the singularity of partnerships in the wider world of private enterprise. The glamour of working with corporate leaders has misled some public school officials about what they should expect and what they should be demanding. When New York City's subways had sunk to a level

of filth and inefficiency that now characterizes the schools, the city did not inaugurate an "adopt-a-train" program with tee shirts and buttons for each conductor. Instead, it raised ten billion extra public dollars and rebuilt the transit leadership from the top down to the shops. And contrary to school practice, that effort was not a voluntary one. New York City's Board of Education hired 6,500 new teachers for its classrooms in 1988: 90 percent were unlicensed and uncertified. Getting them and schools in which they work to a level of competence the children and the city deserve will not be done solely by the volunteer, "feel good" activities characteristic of business partnerships.

The business community discussion at this conference signals two important shifts. First, corporate leaders have become disenchanted with the outcomes of narrowly focused, externally generated, limited-term "projects." Projects are like parachute drops, and one result is to turn school people into cargo cultists who always look up at the sky for their salvation. Moreover, the problems of urban public schools are deeply rooted in questions of race and equity, two volatile political issues. Whatever the rhetoric, the real answers to those questions get determined by individual teachers, with their students, behind the closed doors of school classrooms:

> The more equity-based the need and the more curriculum-centered the topic, the weaker will be the business presence. The California Business Roundtable may be more powerful than a speeding locomotive, the San Francisco Education Fund may be able to leap tall buildings in a single bound, but the teacher and the students hold a kind of "classroom kryptonite"....

> [thus] most partnership activities are low cost, low conflict, peripheral, and largely focused on the middle class.*

Some business leaders have noticed the political limits of their own interventions in the traditional "project" mode and are now shifting to advocacy of choice mechanisms, such as parent selection among alternate schools, that would use market strategies and market consequences to lever more thorough reform. Part of the motive here is dismay about the ability of school officials to keep their part of the bargain. Where business has delivered support, have school people delivered reform? In some places, notably Boston, the implicit answer is "No." Rather than withdraw from the field, the Boston business community has created another mechanism to do school reform, one that is wholly controlled by the business community, with no school representatives.

The second shift, signaled during this conference, is away from the school and away from the child-as-student to the wider context and to what are sometimes called "whole child" strategies. Although help has been concentrated on at-risk students in schools, those same children are battered by their after school, year-round, community and family experiences. The "child budget" for most municipalities spends only about fifty cents of every dollar through the schools. The balance is spent by welfare agencies, parks and recreation, hospitals, early childhood agencies, mental health organizations, family workers, and other

---

* Dale Mann, "Business Involvement and Public School Improvement," Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 69 (October and November, 1987), Part 1, p.231. This publication contains an extended development of many issues discussed in this paper.

organizations. The "whole child" shift is a search for allies and a recognition of the multiple source of educational disadvantage. In Oregon, Governor Neal Goldschmidt has created a "Children's Agenda"; in New York, Commissioner Thomas Sobol and the Board of Regents are building a similar approach. If public support for the flawed institution of the urban school is at a limit, then we may all have to work smarter. Service orchestration could well be the issue of the '90's, but it comes in two parts--technical and political. The administrative techniques of coordinating across agencies are far more certain than the politics of union turfing, municipal fratricide, and circular recrimination among city bureaucracies. Dealing with the politics of service orchestration will require a larger vision and greater political clout than is characteristic of most urban politicians. Finally, it is worth noting that the shift to "whole child" strategies is prompted not only by a strategic analysis of the sources of disadvantage, but by a frustration with the public school. We are in the process of giving up on public schools as the central "problem-solvers" of our cities.

Sad though that may seem, it recognizes the limits of the school as an institution. The problems that teachers must overcome do not originate in the school. School did not invent TV, promote divorce, or refine cocoa leaves into paste. In 1950, sixty percent of all American households were equipped with fathers in paid employment, mothers at home, and two children. By 1980, the proportion of such families had dropped from sixty percent to seven percent. Half of all urban children live in single parent homes. The number of two-parent, intact homes, where both parents are working and the family is still in poverty, has increased by two-thirds in the last eight years. Schools did not create the reality of such a

disadvantage. But it is children from these families who typically attend public schools.

URBAN SCHOOLS

Chancellor Green refers to New York's public school children as "darker and different." High risk students are also high need students and that means high cost. Most of these students also achieve less in public schools, and it is only a slight jump to perceive such children as being what Edward Banfield terms "the undeserving poor." Building or even preserving a political coalition for such high cost, low achieving, "undeserving poor" students becomes more difficult every day, as illustrated by the recent Presidential campaign in which both parties walked away from educational equity.

Can disinterest be turned around? Any caring person is appalled by the daily reality of the urban underclass: drugs, family dislocation, crushing poverty, crime, a culture of despair, a hierarchy of exploitation or at best indifference. The description is accurate, but the most common conclusion, especially among teachers, is frustration followed by withdrawal. The central problem of our national educational policy is not what we can do to assist children who already know how to read, who have supportive, intact families, but what if anything, can the public schools do with students who do not have such essential "family capital."

In the 1960's, "compensatory education" was a common term. Its disappearance from our vocabularies is one indicator of our withdrawal from a vision of the public school that might, in fact, serve those children who most need the public school, the urban underclass. A key question is about pedagogy. If asked, "Can children from low income families be brought to

the same level of mastery with respect to basic skills acquisition as can children from other, more privileged backgrounds in urban public schools?" How would you answer? And how, based on your experience, would teachers, principals, professors, and business leaders answer?

If such pedagogy exists and if it is possible to compensate for family background, race, and social class, then the urban public school as an institution has a future. If not, then what? My own answer relies on the breakthroughs of mastery learning, outcomes-based instruction, new technologies and access to the home through cable TV, effective teaching, cooperative learning, instrumental enrichment, accelerated schooling, and effective schooling. The possibility of a truly effective public school makes the questions of school improvement a central, moral issue. In that regard, the real contribution of the university is in developing, testing, synthesizing, and codifying those breakthroughs. To be helpful, the applied departments of university faculties should be less precious about their research agendas and less squeamish about their recommendations. Unfortunately, most university people spend more time discounting and denying the validity of advances than they do pursuing the implementation of educational strategies that may work.

REFLECTIONS

Business/school partnerships, even augmented with university participation, cannot reform the public schools. And not only students are at risk. I believe that the survival of public schools, as they exist today, is at risk. A recent Harris poll indicated that fifty-one percent of American parents, if they had the money, would take their children out of public schools. Three-fourths of the American electorate have no school age

children. David Kearns, the president and chief executive officer of Xerox, has recently augmented his support for public schools with very sharp criticism. He resents doing the "product recall" work of the public school, namely, providing basic skills to newly hired employees who should have learned those things in school. Kearns has concluded that the public school monopoly should be broken. Other business leaders, still a minority, have simply given up.

The future of business partnerships with public schools is not unlike the future of business support for public activities in general. Business supports the opera, hospitals, the Boy Scouts, and the United Way. Corporations will continue to sponsor projects and universities will continue to do research about schools. (Whether or not the teacher training mission of universities will be captured by the teacher unions is another question.) But the main reform agenda remains centered on the official actors and on pedagogy. Teachers, their unions, principals, superintendents, and school boards have to ask themselves whether or not they believe that children from low income families can be schooled. They have to assess the the stock of new, more powerful developments in pedagogy; and if they agree that more potent techniques exist but are not now used in classrooms and schools, then they need to ask themselves whether or not they are willing to close the gap between what they do and what they should do.

For the non-school participants, our role is best expressed in that simple but elegant locution of leaders everywhere--"strokes and pokes." To support public schools, we should celebrate their achievements, and get more resources for them; we should also remain critical and demanding. If teachers are to have high expectations of children, then administrators

must have high expectations of teachers, and the public must have high expectations of its urban schools. We must replace a culture of defeatism with a vision of the possibility of the public school.

In the 1930's, George Counts wrote an intriguing article, "Dare the School Change Society?" The question has been moot for half a century because we have not had a pedagogy powerful enough to compensate for what the most needy children do not have from their families. The irony is that, just as a transforming pedagogy is now becoming available, and just as Counts's question is susceptible to a positive answer, the question itself is shifting. Unless we act on the possibilities of the urban school, unless we engage the question of school reform in ways that are far more serious and more contentious than we have to date, the question of the 1990's will be, "Dare society replace the public school?" Unless we act, that decision will pass from our hands and the dream of a public school will pass from this society.